

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4 OAKLAND DIVISION
5

6 LISSETTE MUNOZ, et al.,

7 Plaintiffs,

8 vs.

9 CITY OF DALY CITY, et al.,

10 Defendants.

Case No: 19-cv-00465 SBA

**ORDER DENYING STIPULATION
TO CONTINUE TRIAL DATE AND
PRE-TRIAL DEADLINES
WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

Dkt. 49

11 On February 21, 2020, the parties filed a stipulation to continue the trial date and
12 pre-trial deadlines. Dkt. 49. Once entered, a scheduling order “may be modified only for
13 good cause and with the judge’s consent.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(4). The parties state that
14 an “attached declaration of counsel sets forth the asserted good cause for the stipulation.”
15 Dkt. 49 at 3. However, no declaration is attached, and the stipulation itself fails to set forth
16 good cause to modify the pretrial schedule. See Zivkovic v. S. Cal. Edison Co., 302 F.3d
17 1080, 1087 (9th Cir. 2002) (“good cause” may be shown where pretrial deadlines cannot
18 reasonably be met despite the diligence of the those seeking the extension). Accordingly,
19 the parties’ stipulation is DENIED without prejudice to the re-filing of a stipulation that
20 sets forth the requisite good cause.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: 02/24/20

23 
24 SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG
25 Senior United States District Judge
26
27
28